



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

VARIA.

I.—*Sophocles*, *Oed. Tyr.*, vs. 328–9 in most editions read :

πάντες γὰρ οὐ φρονεῖτ' . ἐγὼ δ' οὐ μήποτε
τᾶμ' ὥς ἂν εἴπω μὴ τὰ σ' ἐκφύγω κακά.

The words τᾶμ' ὥς ἂν are plain nonsense. Dindorf says they are interpolated, but does not suggest a substitute for them. A recent critic in the *Ἀθήναιον* proposes to read *ἰταμῶς τὰδ' εἴπω*, which gives good sense, but involves an unnecessarily violent change. Much preferable would be *ἰταμῶς ἀνείπω* ; but the adverb *ἰταμῶς* seems to be late Greek, and *ἀνείπων* without an object would be somewhat difficult to render. The true reading appears to be *τάδ' ὥς ἀνείπω*, which involves the change of only one letter and gives exactly the sense required. “For ye are all in ignorance ; but even so (ὥς) I will never publish these things lest I bring to light your woes.” *Ἀνείπων* and *ἐκφαίνω* occur in the same sentence in *Xenoph. Kyr. IV*, 5, 56.

In the same play v. 37, instead of *καὶ ταῦθ' ὅφ' ἡμῶν οὐδέν ἐξειδῶς πλέον*, which in the circumstances would be meaningless, I would read *καὶ ταῦτα φημῶν κ.τ.λ.*, which expresses exactly what Oedipus no doubt wished to be believed. *Φήμη* is frequently used, even in this play, in the sense of *χρησμός*.

v. 227, *καὶ μὲν φοβεῖται, τοῦ πικλῆμ' ὑπεξελών*, which seems to have caused so much trouble to editors, may be corrected with ease and almost perfect certainty by reading *καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι*, which makes the whole passage simple and logical. The only objection to this emendation is that *ὑπεξελών* is in the nominative case, whereas we should expect *ὑπεξελλόντα* ; but such anacoloutha in the case of participles are by no means uncommon. See the examples cited by Kühner, *Gr. Gr.* § 493.

In the difficult lines, 478–9,

πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος
μέλεος μελέῳ ποδὶ χηρεύων

or as some read,

πέτρας, ὥς ταῦρος κ.τ.λ.

I believe we ought to read

πέτρας ὅπως ταῦρος

and correct the corresponding line in the strophe by adding a ς to πόδα, so as to read

φυγᾶ πόδας νωμᾶν.

Σθεναρῶτερον in the line above may, of course, be an adverb. This makes sense and metre both perfect.

II.—One of the most curious examples of that tendency, so common among German critics, to alter the text of an author in favor of a preconceived and false theory, occurs in Pausanias V 11, 8, where the author is describing the base of the throne of the Olympian Zeus. In the ordinary editions the passage reads thus: Ἐπὶ τούτου τοῦ βάθρου χρυσᾶ ποιήματα, ἀναβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ἄρμα Ἥλιος, καὶ Ζεὺς τέ ἐστι καὶ Ἥρα, παρὰ δὲ αὐτὸν Χάρις· ταύτης δὲ Ἑρμῆς ἔχεται, τοῦ δὲ Ἑρμοῦ Ἑστία· μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑστίαν Ἑρως ἐστὶν ἐκ θαλάσσης Ἀφροδίτην ἀνιῶσαν ὑποδεχόμενος· τὴν δὲ Ἀφροδίτην στεφανοῖ Πειθώ. ἐπείρασται δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλων σὺν Ἀρτέμιδι, Ἀθηνᾶ τε καὶ Ἡρακλῆς, καὶ ἤδη τοῦ βάθρου πρὸς τῷ πέρατι Ἀμφιτρίτη καὶ Ποσειδῶν, Σελήνη τε Ἰππον ἔμοι δοκεῖν ἐλαύνουσα. Now, for some inconceivable reason or another, all German archaeologists, *e. g.* Overbeck, Brunn, Petersen, have assumed that the subject of the work here described was the birth of Aphrodite, and that the figures were arranged in this order, beginning at the left: Helios, Zeus, Hera, Charis, [Hephaistos], Hermes, Hestia—Eros, Aphrodite, Peitho—Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Herakles, Amphitrite, Poseidon, Selene. This makes Aphrodite the central figure; but in order to have the same number of personages on each side of her, the name of Hephaistos has to be violently inserted. This the upholders of the theory justify on the ground that αὐτόν in the phrase παρὰ δὲ αὐτόν Χάρις, implies that the name of some male divinity has been left out. But it is perfectly plain, for a dozen reasons, that the subject of the work was not the birth of Aphrodite at all,—indeed, with what propriety could the birth of Aphrodite from the sea have been made the subject of the only decoration of the base of the statue of Zeus?—but the marriage of Zeus and Hera, a most appropriate subject for the position. I have demonstrated this at length in an article in the *American Art Review*. Pausanias, after speaking of the sun,

already risen above the level of the group of gods, begins his description of that group in his usual, and indeed in the only natural way, with the middle figures. The group then arranges itself in the most natural way thus: Helios (above the group), Peitho, Aphrodite, Eros, Hestia, Hermes, Charis—Hera, Zeus—Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Herakles, Poseidon, Amphitrite, Selene (above the group). The sun and moon are in the sky, the two end groups in the sea, the rest upon Olympus. On each side of the bridal pair are six figures. All that is necessary in order to make the passage in Pausanias correct, is to change one letter, and read αὐτήν for αὐτόν—παρά δὲ αὐτήν Χάρις.

III.—*Herodotos* VIII, 64. It is curious what mistakes a mere etymological and grammatical interpretation of Greek will sometimes lead people into. Herodotos, describing the preparations for the battle of Salamis, says: "Ἐδοξε δὲ σφι (τοῖς στρατηγοῖς) εὔξασθαι τοῖσι θεοῖσι καὶ ἐπικαλέσασθαι τοὺς Αἰακίδας συμμάχους . . . εὐξάμενοι γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι αὐτόθεν μὲν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος Αἴαντά τε καὶ Τελαμῶνα ἐπικαλέοντο, ἐπὶ δὲ Αἰαχὸν καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Αἰακίδας νῆα ἀπέστειλλον ἐς Αἴγιναν. Rawlinson gives the following translation of these words: "Whereupon the Greeks resolved *to approach the gods with prayer*, and likewise *to send and invite* the Aeacids to their aid. . . . *Prayers were offered* to all the gods; and Telamon and Ajax *were invoked at once* from Salamis, while a ship was sent to Aegina to fetch Aeacus himself, and the other Aeacids." Now, in one instance ἐπικαλέομαι is translated *to send and invite*, in another *to invoke*. In the present connection neither rendering is correct. The meaning in both cases is "to send and bring." Αὐτόθεν, moreover, does not mean "at once," but "from where they were"—αὐτόθεν ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος, from Salamis where they were. This is plain from the fact that a ship was sent to Aegina to fetch the statues of the Aeacidae there worshipped. Had there been a mere question of inviting or invoking, the ship would have been entirely unnecessary.

Again, εὔξασθαι is translated, in one instance, *to approach* (the gods) *with prayer*, in another, *to offer prayers*. Again the translation is wrong in both cases. The true rendering is "to make vows." This is plainly shown by a passage in Plutarch's *Life of Perikles* (cap. xvii), where we are told that the great Athenian statesman sent to all the states of Greece asking them πέμπειν Ἀθήναζε τοὺς βουλευσομένους περὶ . . . τῶν θυσιῶν, ἃς ὀφείλουσιν

ὅπερ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐὺξάμενοι τοῖς θεοῖς (as having *vowed* them to the gods) ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐμάχοντο. We are too apt to forget that praying among the Greeks and Romans, at least on all great occasions, involved vowing, and that the vowing, indeed, was the object of the praying. I have no doubt that the Homeric phrases πολλὰ εὔξασθαι and μεγάλα εὔξασθαι should in every case be rendered, respectively, "to vow many offerings," and "to vow large offerings." One might indeed pray much (πολλά); but it is hard to see how one could pray large or big (μεγάλα). What is true of εὔχομαι is true of ἀρᾶσθαι. See Iliad I, 35 and 43, where the two words are used of the same act. In line 35, the words πολλὰ ἡρᾶτο can hardly mean "he prayed much"; for the prayer is given, and occupies only six lines. It must mean he "vowed much," and indeed a very large offering is *implied* in the prayer. No doubt there is plenty of examples of the use of εὔχομαι in which the element of vowing is not at all prominent.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.